



## **Geotechnical Investigation**

Proposed Automotive Dealership and Body Shop  
5254 Bank Street  
Ottawa, Ontario

Prepared for:

Unpoised Architecture Inc.  
5-16 Sweetland Ave.  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1N 7T6

Attention: Sam Cox

LRL File No.: 220536; *Old File No. 190271*

July 6, 2023



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>SITE AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>PROCEDURE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>SUBSURFACE SOIL AND GROUNDWATER CONDITIONS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
4.1	General .....	2
4.2	Topsoil.....	2
4.3	Asphalt .....	3
4.4	Fill Material.....	3
4.5	Silt.....	3
4.6	Silt and Sand.....	3
4.7	Limestone Bedrock.....	3
4.8	Refusal.....	3
4.9	Laboratory Analysis .....	3
4.10	Groundwater Conditions.....	4
<b>5</b>	<b>GEOTECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
5.1	Foundations .....	4
5.2	Shallow Foundation on Structural Fill.....	5
5.3	Shallow foundation on Bedrock .....	5
5.4	Lateral Earth Pressure.....	5
5.5	Settlement .....	6
5.6	Liquefaction .....	6
5.7	Seismic.....	6
5.8	Frost Protection .....	6
5.9	Foundation Walls Backfill (Shallow Foundations).....	7
5.10	Slab-on-grade Construction.....	7
5.11	Corrosion Potential and Cement Type .....	7
<b>6</b>	<b>EXCAVATION AND BACKFILLING REQUIREMENTS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
6.1	Excavation.....	8
6.2	Groundwater Control.....	8
6.3	Pipe Bedding Requirements .....	9



<b>6.4</b>	<b>Trench Backfill</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>REUSE OF ON-SITE SOILS</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED PAVEMENT STRUCTURE</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>8.1</b>	<b>Paved Areas &amp; Subgrade Preparation</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>INSPECTION SERVICES</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>REPORT CONDITIONS AND LIMITATIONS</b> .....	<b>11</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 1 – Sieve Analysis Summary</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Table 2 – Gradation Analysis Summary</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Table 3 – Material and Earth Pressure Properties</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Table 4 – Results of Chemical Analysis</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Table 5 – Recommended Pavement Structure</b> .....	<b>9</b>

## APPENDICES

<b>Appendix A</b>	<b>Site and Borehole Location Plans</b>
<b>Appendix B</b>	<b>Borehole Logs</b>
<b>Appendix C</b>	<b>Symbols and Terms Used in Borehole Logs</b>
<b>Appendix D</b>	<b>Laboratory Results</b>



## 1 INTRODUCTION

LRL Associates Ltd. (LRL) was originally retained by Holzman Consultants Inc. to perform a geotechnical investigation for a proposed automotive shop, located at 5254 Bank Street, Ottawa, Ontario. A subsequent additional geotechnical investigation was carried out for submission for site plan application. LRL was retained by Unpoised Architecture Inc. for this subsequent mandate. Additional boreholes located within the proposed building footprint for requested by the City of Ottawa.

The purpose of the investigation was to identify the subsurface conditions across the site by the completion of a borehole drilling program. Based on the visual and factual information obtained, this report will provide guidelines on the geotechnical engineering aspects of the design of the project, including construction considerations.

This report has been prepared in consideration of the terms and conditions noted above. Should there be any changes in the design features, which may relate to the geotechnical recommendations provided in the report, LRL should be advised in order to review the report recommendations.

## 2 SITE AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The site under investigation is currently used for residential purposes. The site consists of a single-storey residential dwelling, a detached double car garage, and multiple storage buildings at the rear portion of the property. The site is rectangular in shape, having a total surface area of about 1,740 m<sup>2</sup>. The general topography of the eastern portion of the site is considered to be relatively flat. An approximate 3.5 m high slope is present in the north-south direction at the middle of the site. Access to the site comes by way of Bank Street, and is civically located at 5254 Bank Street, Ottawa, Ontario. The location is presented in Figure 1 included in **Appendix A**.

It is understood that the new development will consist of a proposed Automotive Dealership and Body Shop. At the time of generating this report, no preliminary information is available pertaining to the proposed building details.

## 3 PROCEDURE

The fieldwork for this investigation was carried out on October 8, 2019 and June 9, 2023. Prior to the fieldwork, the site was cleared for the presence of any underground services and utilities. A total of eight (8) boreholes will drilled across the site, and labelled BH1 through BH8. BH1 through BH5 were drilled on October 8, 2019, and BH6 through BH8 were drilled on June 9, 2023. The approximate locations of the boreholes are shown in Figure 2 included in **Appendix A**.

The boreholes were advanced using a truck mount CME 55 drill rig equipped with 200 mm diameter continuous flight hollow stem auger supplied and operated by CCC Geotechnical and Environmental Drilling Ltd. A “two man” crew experienced with geotechnical drilling operated the drill rig and equipment.

Sampling of the overburden materials encountered in the boreholes was carried out at regular depth intervals using a 50.8 mm diameter drive open conventional spoon sampler in conjunction with standard penetration testing (SPT) “N” values. The SPT were conducted following the method **ASTM D1586** and the results of SPT, in terms of the



number of blows per 0.3 m of split-spoon sampler penetration after first 0.15 m designated as “N” value.

All boreholes were advanced until practical auger refusal over bedrock. The boreholes were terminated at depths ranging from 0.7 to 3.7 m below ground surface (bgs). Upon completion, the boreholes were backfilled using the overburden cuttings, and topped with asphalt cold patch where required.

The fieldwork was supervised throughout by a member of our engineering staff who oversaw the drilling activities, cared for the samples obtained and logged the subsurface conditions encountered within each of the boreholes. All soil samples were transported back to our office for further evaluation. The recovered soil samples collected from the boreholes were classified based on visual examination of the materials recovered and the results of the in-situ testing.

Furthermore, all boreholes were located using a Garmin Etrex Legend GPS (Global Positioning System) receiver using NAD 83 datum (North American Datum). The existing grade elevations at the borehole locations were determined by interpolation from the georeferenced autoCAD file of the “Site Development Plan” generated by LRL. Ground surface elevations of boring locations are shown on their respective boreholes logs.

## **4 SUBSURFACE SOIL AND GROUNDWATER CONDITIONS**

### **4.1 General**

A review of local surficial geology maps provided by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources Canada suggest that the surficial geology for this area consists of bedrock. The bedrock is of the Oxford Formation, consisting of dolomite and limestone.

The subsurface conditions encountered in the boreholes were classified based on visual and tactile examination of the materials recovered from the boreholes. The soil descriptions presented in this report are based on commonly accepted methods of classification and identification employed in geotechnical practice. Classification and identification of soil were conducted according to the procedure **ASTM D2487** and judgement, and LRL does not guarantee descriptions as exact, but infers accuracy to the extent that is common in current geotechnical practice.

The subsurface soil conditions encountered are given in their respective borehole logs presented in **Appendix B**. A greater explanation of the information presented in the borehole logs can be found in **Appendix C** of this report. These logs indicate the subsurface conditions encountered at a specific test location only. Boundaries between zones on the logs are often not distinct, but are rather transitional and have been interpreted as such.

### **4.2 Topsoil**

Topsoil of thickness ranging from 100 to 450 mm was found at the surface at boring locations BH1, BH2, BH4, and BH5.

This material was classified as topsoil based on colour and the presence of organic material and is intended as identification for geotechnical purposes only. It does not constitute a statement as to the suitability of this layer for cultivation and sustaining plant growth



### **4.3 Asphalt**

At the surface of BH3, a 50 mm thick layer of asphalt was encountered.

### **4.4 Fill Material**

Underlying the topsoil in BH1, BH2, BH4, and BH5, the asphalt in BH3, and at the surface of BH6 through BH8, a layer of fill material was encountered, and extended to depths ranging from 0.4 and 1.5 m bgs. Generally, this material consisted of a brown sandy material, with some gravel. In BH1, the fill material contained some organic material. Standard Penetration Tests (SPT) were carried out in this layer, and the SPT “N” values were found ranging between 8 and 18, indicating loose to compact in compactness. The natural moisture content was varying between 4 and 15%.

### **4.5 Silt**

Underlying the fill material in BH3, a layer of silt was encountered, and extended to a depth of 3.7 m bgs. This material can be described as silt, some sand, trace gravel sized stone, and brown. The SPT “N” value was found ranging between 8 and 68, indicating the material is loose, becoming dense to very dense with increased depth. The natural moisture contents were determined to be 10 and 11%.

### **4.6 Silt and Sand**

Underlying the fill material in BH6, a layer of silt and sand was encountered and extended to a depth of 2.84 m bgs. This can be described as having trace clay, greyish brown, and moist. SPT “N” values were found ranging between 1 and 11, indicating the material is very loose to compact. The natural moisture contents were determined to range between 10 and 15%.

### **4.7 Limestone Bedrock**

Underlying the fill material in BH2 and BH4, limestone bedrock was encountered, and extended to depths of 1.1 and 0.7 m bgs (end of exploration depth) respectively. This material was found to be weathered at the surface, and grey in colour.

### **4.8 Refusal**

Practical auger refusal over bedrock was encountered in all boreholes, refusal occurred at depths ranging from 0.7 to 3.7 m bgs.

### **4.9 Laboratory Analysis**

One (1) soil sample collected from BH3 was selected for sieve analysis. The results are summarized in **Table 1** below.



**Table 1: Sieve Analysis Summary**

Sample Location	Depth (m)	Percent for Each Soil Gradation						Estimated Hydraulic Conductivity K (cm/s)
		Gravel		Sand			Fines	
		Coarse (%)	Fine (%)	Coarse (%)	Medium (%)	Fine (%)	Silt & Clay (%)	
BH3	2.3 – 2.9	0.0	3.4	0.4	1.6	17.9	76.7	$7 \times 10^{-6}$

Two (2) soil samples were collected for laboratory gradation analyses. The gradation analyses comprised of sieve and hydrometer were conducted following the procedure **ASTM D422**. Details of laboratory analyses are reflected in **Table 2**.

**Table 2: Gradation Analysis Summary**

Sample Location	Depth (m)	Percent for Each Soil Gradation							Estimated Hydraulic Conductivity K (m/s)
		Gravel		Sand			Silt (%)	Clay (%)	
		Coarse (%)	Fine (%)	Coarse (%)	Medium (%)	Fine (%)			
BH6	2.3-2.9	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.6	35.3	62.4	1.5	$7 \times 10^{-6}$
BH8	0.8-1.2	0.0	3.2	3.3	7.9	29.9	52.0	3.7	$7 \times 10^{-6}$

#### 4.10 Groundwater Conditions

Groundwater was carefully monitored during this investigation, during and after completion of drilling, no groundwater was encountered.

It is anticipated that the groundwater level is within the bedrock surface, at an elevation less than 109.880 m.

It should be noted that groundwater levels could fluctuate with seasonal weather conditions, (i.e.: rainfall, droughts, spring thawing) and due to construction activities at or in the vicinity of the site.

### 5 GEOTECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS

This section of the report provides general geotechnical recommendations for the design aspect of the proposed development based on our interpretation of the information gathered from the borehole data performed at this site and from the project requirements.

#### 5.1 Foundations

Based on the subsurface soil conditions established at this site, it is recommended that the footings for any proposed buildings be founded below the frost penetration depth, on either structural fill, or bedrock. In order to limit the potential of excessive differential



settlement, the footings should rest entirely on bedrock or structural fill, and not a combination of both.

Given the subsurface conditions encountered at this site, there are no restrictions for maximum footing dimensions nor grade raise restrictions. In order to have a dry and stable subgrade, ground water (if encountered), should be kept 0.3 m below the proposed underside of footing. This can be achieved by pumping from open sump pits.

## 5.2 Shallow Foundation on Structural Fill

Conventional strip and column footings set over properly compacted and approved structural fill having a minimum thickness of 300 mm conforming to OPSS Granular B Type II or approved equivalent may be designed for a maximum allowable bearing pressure of **150 kPa** for Serviceability Limit State (SLS) and **225 kPa** for Ultimate Limit State (ULS) factored bearing resistance. The factored ULS value includes the geotechnical resistance factor of 0.5. The structural fill shall be compacted to 98% of its Standard Proctor Maximum Dry Density (SPMDD).

Prior to placing the approved structural fill, the subgrade level should be inspected and assessed by a geotechnical engineer, or a representative to identify any localised incompetent/unstable areas of the subgrade. Any incompetent subgrade areas as identified must be sub-excavated and backfilled with approved structural fill and compacted to 98% of its SPMDD. In order to allow the spread of load beneath the footings and to prevent undermining during construction, the structural fill should extend minimum 1.2 m beyond the outside edges of the footings and then outward and downward at 1 horizontal to 1 vertical profile (or flatter) over a distance equal to the depth of the structural fill below the footing.

## 5.3 Shallow foundation on Bedrock

Conventional strip and column footings set over sound bedrock may be designed using a maximum allowable bearing pressure of **750 kPa** for Ultimate Limit State (**ULS**) factored bearing resistance. This maximum allowable bearing pressure is a typically, conservative value for Limestone in the Ottawa area.

Serviceability Limit State (**SLS**) does not apply for footings founded on bedrock since failure of the concrete would occur before unacceptable settlement of the foundation. Prior to pouring the footing, the rock should be free of any soil, debris or deleterious substances and should be inspected by a geotechnical engineer.

## 5.4 Lateral Earth Pressure

The following equation should be used to estimate the intensity of the lateral earth pressure against any earth retaining structure/foundation walls.

$$P = K (\gamma h + q)$$

Where;

P = Earth pressure at depth h;

K = Appropriate coefficient of earth pressure;

$\gamma$  = Unit weight of compacted backfill, adjacent to the wall;

h = Depth (below adjacent to the highest grade) at which P is calculated;





$q$  = Intensity of any surcharge distributed uniformly over the backfill surface (usually surcharge from traffic, equipment or soil stockpiled and typically considered 10 kPa).

The coefficient of earth pressure at rest ( $K_0$ ) should be used in the calculation of the earth pressure on the storm water manhole/basement walls, which are expected to be rather rigid and not to deflect.

The above expression assumes that perimeter drainage system prevents the build-up of any hydrostatic pressure behind the foundation wall.

**Table 3** below provides various material types and their respective earth pressure properties.

**Table 3: Material and Earth Pressure Properties**

Type of Material	Bulk Density (kN/m <sup>3</sup> )	Friction Angle (Φ)	Pressure Coefficient		
			At Rest ( $K_0$ )	Active ( $K_A$ )	Passive ( $K_P$ )
Granular A	23.0	34	0.44	0.28	3.53
Granular B Type I	20.0	31	0.49	0.32	3.12
Granular B Type II	23.0	32	0.47	0.31	3.25
Fill	17.5	30	0.50	0.33	3.00

### 5.5 Settlement

The estimated total settlement of the shallow foundations, designed using the recommended serviceability limit state capacity value, as well as other recommendations given above, will be less than 25 mm. The differential settlement between adjacent column footings is anticipated to be 15 mm or less.

### 5.6 Liquefaction

For footings constructed on either bedrock or properly prepared structural fill, liquefaction is not considered to be a concern for this site.

### 5.7 Seismic

Based on the information of this geotechnical investigation and in accordance with the Ontario Building Code 2015 (Table 4.1.8.4.A.) and Canadian Foundation Engineering Manual (4<sup>th</sup> edition), the site can be classified for Seismic Site Response Site Class C.

The above classifications were recommended based on conventional method exercised for Site Classification for Seismic Site Response and in accordance with the generally accepted geotechnical engineering practice. A greater Site Classification might be able to be achieved by carrying out site specific seismic testing, such as shear wave velocity testing.

### 5.8 Frost Protection

All exterior footings located in any unheated portions of the proposed building should be protected against frost heaving by providing a minimum of 1.5 m of earth cover. Areas that are to be cleared of snow (i.e. sidewalks, paved areas, etc.) should be provided with at least 1.8 m of earth cover for frost protection purposes. Alternatively, the required frost



protection could be provided using a combination of earth cover and extruded polystyrene insulation. Detailed guidelines for footing insulation frost protection can be provided upon request.

In the event that foundations are to be constructed during winter months, the foundation soils are required to be protected from freezing temperatures using suitable construction techniques. The base of all excavations should be insulated from freezing temperatures immediately upon exposure, until heat can be supplied to the building interior and the footings have sufficient soil cover to prevent freezing of the subgrade soils.

### **5.9 Foundation Walls Backfill (Shallow Foundations)**

To prevent possible lateral loading, the backfill material against any foundation walls, grade beams, isolated walls, or piers should consist of free draining, non-frost susceptible material such as sand or sand and gravel meeting OPSS Granular B Type I or equivalent grading requirements.

The foundation wall backfill should be compacted to minimum 95% of its standard Proctor maximum dry density (SPMDD) using light compaction equipment, where no loads will be set over top. The compaction shall be increased to 98% of its SPMDD under walkways, slabs or paved areas close to the foundation or retaining walls. Backfilling against foundation walls should be carried out on both sides of the wall at the same time where applicable.

### **5.10 Slab-on-grade Construction**

For predictable performance for a slab-on-grade, it should rest over structural fill only. Therefore, all material shall be removed from the building's footprint. The exposed subgrade surface should then be inspected and approved by geotechnical personnel.

Any underfloor fill needed to raise the general floor grade shall consist of OPSS Granular B Type I material or an approved equivalent, compacted to 95% of its SPMDD. The final lift shall be compacted to 98% of its SPMDD. A 200 mm thick layer of Granular A meeting the **OPSS 1010** shall be placed underneath the slab and compacted to 100% of its SPMDD.

It is also recommended that area of extensive exterior slab-on-grade (sidewalks, ramp etc.) shall be constructed using Granular B subbase of thickness 300 mm and Granular A base of thickness 150 mm with incorporating subdrain facilities. The modulus of subgrade reaction ( $k_s$ ) for the design of the slabs set over structural fill is **24 MPa/m**.

In order to further minimize and control cracking, the floor slab shall be provided with wire or fibre mesh reinforcement and construction or control joints. The construction or control joints should be spaced equal distance in both directions and should not exceed 4.5 m. The wire or fibre mesh reinforcement shall be carried out through the joints.

If any areas of the proposed building area are to remain unheated during the winter period, thermal protection of the slab on grade may be required. The "Guide for Concrete Floor and Slab Construction", **ACI 302.1R-04** is recommended to follow for the design and construction of vapour retarders below the floor slab. Further details on the insulation requirements could be provided, if necessary.

### **5.11 Corrosion Potential and Cement Type**

A soil sample was submitted to Paracel Laboratories Ltd. for chemical testing. The following **Table 4** below summarizes the results.



**Table 4: Results of Chemical Analysis**

Sample Location	Depth (m)	pH	Sulphate ( $\mu\text{g/g}$ )	Chloride ( $\mu\text{g/g}$ )	Resistivity (Ohm.cm)
BH6	2.3 – 2.9	7.36	19	<10	7,340

The above results revealed a measured sulphate concentration of <10  $\mu\text{g/g}$  in the sample. Based on the CAN/CSA-A23.1 standards (Concrete Materials and Methods of Concrete Construction), a sulphate concentration of less than 1000  $\mu\text{g/g}$  falls within the negligible category for sulphate attack on buried concrete. The test results from soil samples were below the noted threshold. As such, buried concrete for footings and foundations walls will not require any special additive to resist sulphate attack and the use of normal Portland cement is acceptable.

The pH, resistivity and chloride concentration provide an indication of the degree of corrosiveness of the sub-surface environment. The soil resistivity was measured to be 7,340 ohm.cm, which falls between the “moderately corrosive” range for soil resistivity

## **6 EXCAVATION AND BACKFILLING REQUIREMENTS**

### **6.1 Excavation**

It is anticipated that the depth of excavation for the building or any proposed services will not extend below 1.8 – 2.4 m. Excavation must be carried-out in accordance with the Occupational Health and Safety Act and Regulations for Construction Projects.

According to the Ontario’s Occupational Health and Safety Act (OHSA), O. Reg. 213/91 and its amendments, the surficial overburden expected to be excavated into at this site can be classified as Type 3 for fully drained excavations. Therefore, shallow temporary excavations in the overburden soil can be cut at 1 horizontal to 1 vertical, for a fully drained excavation from the base of the excavation and as per requirements of the OHSA regulations.

In the event that the aforementioned slopes are not possible to achieve due to space restrictions, the excavation shall be shored according to OHSA O. Reg. 213/91 and its amendments. Refer to the parameters provided in **Table 3** in **Section 5.4** for use in the design of any shoring structures.

Any excavated material stockpiled near an excavation or trench should be stored at a distance equal to or greater than the depth of the excavation/trench and construction equipment traffic should be limited near open excavation.

### **6.2 Groundwater Control**

Based on the subsurface conditions encountered at this site, groundwater seepage or infiltration into the temporary excavations during construction is expected to be minor in nature, if any. This will be able to be controlled by pumping with open sumps. Surface water runoff into the excavation should be minimized and diverted away from the excavation.

A permit to take water (PTTW) is required from Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC), Ontario Reg. 387/04, if more than 400,000 litres per day of groundwater will be pumped during a construction period less than 30 days. Registration



in the Environmental Activity and Sector Registry (EASR) is required when water takings range between 50,000 and 400,000 litres per day.

The actual amount of groundwater inflow into open excavations will depend on several factors such as the contractor's schedule, rate of excavation, the size of excavation, depth below the groundwater level, and at the time of year which the excavation is executed. It is expected that pumping rates will be less than 50,000 litres per day. As such, EASR registration is not required for the construction at this site.

### **6.3 Pipe Bedding Requirements**

It is anticipated that any underground services required as part of this project will be founded over properly prepared and approved structural fill. Consequently all organic material should be removed down to a suitable bearing layer. Any sub-excavation of disturbed soil should be removed and replaced with a Granular B Type II or approved equivalent, laid in loose lifts of thickness not exceeding 300 mm and compacted to 95% of its SPMDD. Bedding, thickness of cover material and compaction requirements for watermains and sewer pipes should conform to the manufacturer's design requirements and to the detailed installations outlined in the Ontario Provincial Standard Specifications (OPSS) or any other applicable standards.

### **6.4 Trench Backfill**

All service trenches should be backfilled using compactable material, free of organics, debris and large cobbles or boulders. Acceptable native materials (if encountered and where possible) should be used as backfill between the roadway subgrade level and the depth of seasonal frost penetrations (i.e. 1.8 m below finished grade) in order to reduce the potential for differential frost heaving between the new excavated trench and the adjacent section of roadway. Where native backfill is used, it should match the native materials exposed on the trench walls. Backfill below the zone of seasonal frost penetration could consist of either acceptable native material or imported granular material conforming to OPSS Granular B Type II. Any boulders larger than 150 mm in size should not be used as trench backfill.

To minimize future settlement of the backfill and achieve an acceptable subgrade for the roadway, the trench should be compacted in maximum 300 mm thick lifts to at least 95% of its SPMDD. The specified density may be reduced where the trench backfill is not located within or in close proximity to existing roadways or any other structures.

For trenches carried out in existing paved areas, transitions should be constructed to ensure that proper compaction is achieved between any new pavement structure and the existing pavement structure to minimize potential future differential settlement between the existing and new pavement structure. The transition should start at the subgrade level and extend to the underside of the asphaltic concrete level (if any) at a 1 horizontal to 1 vertical slope. This is especially important where trench boxes are used and where no side slopes is provided to the excavation. Where asphaltic concrete is present, it should be cut back to a minimum of 150 mm from the edge of the excavation to allow for proper compaction between the new and existing pavement structures.

## **7 REUSE OF ON-SITE SOILS**

The existing surficial overburden materials consists mostly of a fill material. This material is considered to be frost susceptible and should not be used as backfill material directly against foundation walls or underneath unheated concrete slabs. However, it could be



reused as general backfill material (service trenches, general landscaping/backfilling) if it can be compacted according to the specifications outlined herein at the time of construction and found free from any waste, organics and debris. Any imported material shall conform to OPSS Granular B – Type II or approved equivalent.

It should be noted that the adequacy of any material for reuse as backfill will depend on its water content at the time of its use and on the weather conditions prevailing prior to and during that time. Therefore, all excavated materials to be reused shall be stockpiled in a manner that will prevent any significant changes in their moisture content, especially during wet conditions, and approved for reuse by a geotechnical engineer.

## 8 RECOMMENDED PAVEMENT STRUCTURE

It is anticipated that the subgrade soil for any parking areas and access lanes will consist of the fill material or bedrock. The construction of access lanes and parking areas will be acceptable over these materials, once all debris, organic material, or otherwise deleterious material are removed from the subgrade area. Furthermore, the fill material subgrade must be compacted using a suitable heavy duty compacting equipment and approved by a geotechnical engineer prior to placing any granular base material.

The following **Table 5** presents the recommended pavement structures to be constructed over a stable subgrade along the proposed parking areas and access lane or driveway as part of this project.

**Table 5: Recommended Pavement Structure**

Course	Material	Thickness (mm)	
		Light Duty Parking Area (mm)	Heavy Duty Parking Area (Access Roads, Fire Routes and Trucks) (mm)
Surface	HL3 A/C	50	40
Binder	HL8 A/C	-	50
Base course	Granular A	150	150
Sub base	Granular B Type II	350	450
Total:		500	690

Performance Graded Asphaltic Cement (PGAC) **58-34** is recommended for this project.

The base and subbase granular materials shall conform to **OPSS 1010** material specifications. Any proposed materials shall be tested and approved by a geotechnical engineer prior to delivery to the site and shall be compacted to 98% of its SPMDD. Asphaltic concrete shall conform to **OPSS 1150** and be placed and compacted to at least 95% of the Marshall Density. The mix and its constituents shall be reviewed, tested and approved by a geotechnical engineer prior to delivery to the site.

In areas where the subgrade will consist of bedrock, the Granular B Type II thickness may be reduced to 300 mm for both light and heavy duty areas.

### 8.1 Paved Areas & Subgrade Preparation

The access lanes and parking areas shall be stripped of top soil, vegetation, debris and other obvious objectionable material. Following the backfilling and satisfactory



compaction of any underground service trenches up to the subgrade level, the subgrade shall be shaped, crowned and proof-rolled. A loaded Tandem axle, dual wheel dump truck or approved equivalent heavy duty smooth drum roller shall be used for proof-rolling. Any resulting loose/soft areas should be sub-excavated down to an adequate bearing layer and replaced with approved backfill.

The preparation of subgrade shall be scheduled and carried out in manner so that a protective cover of overlying granular material (if required) is placed as quickly as possible in order to avoid unnecessary circulation by heavy equipment, except on unexcavated or protected surfaces. Frost protection of the surface shall be implemented if works are carried out during the winter season.

The performance of the pavement structure is highly dependent on the subsurface groundwater conditions and maintaining the subgrade and pavement structure in a dry condition. To intercept excess subsurface water within the pavement structure granular materials, sub-drains with suitable outlets should be installed below the pavement area's subgrade if adequate overland flow drainage is not provided (i.e. ditches). The surface of the pavement should be properly graded to direct runoff water towards suitable drainage features. It is recommended that the lateral extent of the subbase and base layers not be terminated vertically immediately behind the curb/edge of pavement line but be extended beyond the curb.

## **9 INSPECTION SERVICES**

The engagement of the services of the geotechnical consultant during construction is recommended to confirm that the subsurface conditions throughout the proposed site do not materially differ from those given in the report and that the construction activities do not adversely affect the intent of the design.

All footing areas and any structural fill areas for the proposed building should be inspected by LRL to ensure that a suitable subgrade has been reached and properly prepared. The placing and compaction of any granular materials beneath the foundations and slab-on-grade should be inspected to ensure that the materials used conform to the grading and compaction specifications.

The subgrade for the pavement areas and underground services should be inspected and approved by geotechnical personnel. In-situ density testing should be carried out on the pavement granular materials, pipe bedding and backfill to ensure the materials meet the specifications for required compaction.

If footings are to be constructed during winter season, the footing subgrade should be protected from freezing temperatures using suitable construction techniques.

## **10 REPORT CONDITIONS AND LIMITATIONS**

It is stressed that the information presented in this report is provided for the guidance of the designers and is intended for this project only. This report has been prepared for a rezoning application, a further investigation may be required during site plan application. The use of this report as a construction document or its use by a third party beyond the client specifically listed in the report is neither intended nor authorized by LRL Associates Ltd. Contractors bidding on or undertaking the works should examine the factual results of the investigation, satisfy themselves as to the adequacy of the information for construction, and make their own interpretation of the factual data as it affects their construction techniques, schedule, safety and equipment capabilities.






The professional services for this project include only the geotechnical aspects of the subsurface conditions at this site. The presence or implications of possible contamination resulting from previous uses or activities at this site or adjacent properties, and/or resulting from the introduction onto the site of materials from off-site sources are outside the terms of reference for this report.

The recommendations provided in this report are based on subsurface data obtained at the specific test pit locations only. Boundaries between zones presented on the test pit logs are often not distinct but transitional and were interpreted. Experience indicates that the subsurface soil and groundwater conditions can vary significantly between and beyond the test locations. For this reason, the recommendations given in this report are subject to a field verification of the subsurface soil conditions at the time of construction.

The recommendations are applicable only to the project described in this report. Any changes to the project will require a review by LRL Associates Ltd., to insure compatibility with the recommendations contained in this project.

We trust this report provides sufficient information for your present purposes. If you have any questions concerning this report or if we may be of further services to you, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,  
LRL Associates Ltd.



Brad Johnson, P. Eng.  
Geotechnical Engineer



W:\FILES 2022\220536\05 Geotechnical\01 Investigation\05 Reports\2023-07-06\_Additional Geotechnical Investigation\_5254 Bank Street\_LRL 220536.docx



**APPENDIX A**  
**Site and Borehole Location Plan**





**LRJ**

ENGINEERING | INGÉNIÉRIE

5430 Canotek Road | Ottawa, ON, K1J 9G2  
www.lri.ca | (613) 842-3434

PROJECT

GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION  
PROPOSED INDUSTRIAL SERVICE/ REPAIR BUILDING  
5254 BANK STREET  
OTTAWA, ONTARIO

DRAWING TITLE

SITE LOCATION  
SOURCE: GEOOTTAWA

CLIENT

UNPOISED ARCHITECTURE INC.


DATE

JUNE 2023

PROJECT

220536

**FIGURE 1**





**LRJ**

ENGINEERING | INGÉNIERIE

5430 Canotek Road | Ottawa, ON, K1J 9G2  
www.lri.ca | (613) 842-3434

PROJECT

GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION  
PROPOSED INDUSTRIAL SERVICE/ REPAIR BUILDING  
5254 BANK STREET  
OTTAWA, ONTARIO

DRAWING TITLE

BOREHOLE LOCATION  
SOURCE: GOOGLE AERIAL VIEW

CLIENT

UNPOISED ARCHITECTURE INC.

DATE

JUNE 2023

PROJECT

220536

**FIGURE 2**



**APPENDIX B**  
**Borehole Logs**



**Project No.:** 190271

**Client:** Holzman Consultants Inc.

**Date:** October 8, 2019

**Borehole Log: BH1**

**Project:** Proposed Automotive Dealership and Body Shop

**Location:** 5254 Bank Street, Ottawa ON

**Field Personnel:** BJ

**Driller:** CCC Geotech and Enviro Drilling Ltd.

**Drilling Equipment:** Truck Mount CME 55

**Drilling Method:** HSA

SUBSURFACE PROFILE		SAMPLE DATA					Shear Strength × (kPa) × 50 100 150 200	Water Content ▽ (%) ▽ 25 50 75	Water Level (Standpipe or Open Borehole)	
Depth ft m	Soil Description	Elev./Depth(m)	Lithology	Type	Sample Number	N or RQD	Recovery (%)	SPT N Value ○ (Blows/0.3 m) ○ 20 40 60 80		Liquid Limit □ (%) □ 25 50 75
0	Ground Surface	110.17								
0	Topsoil- sandy, about 450 mm thick.	0.00								
1		109.72			SS1	7	42	7	9	
2	FILL- sand, some organic material, brown, moist, compact.	0.45								
3										
4					SS2	15	75	15	9	
5	End of Borehole	1.37								

**Easting:** 454743 m

**Northing:** 5015270 m

**Site Datum:** Site Benchmark - 2 nails in utility pole - 116.310 m

**Groundsurface Elevation:** 110.170 m

**Top of Riser Elev.:** N/A

**Hole Diameter:** 200 mm

**NOTES:** Borehole terminated after practical auger refusal.



**Project No.:** 190271

**Client:** Holzman Consultants Inc.

**Date:** October 8, 2019

**Borehole Log: BH2**

**Project:** Proposed Automotive Dealership and Body Shop

**Location:** 5254 Bank Street, Ottawa ON

**Field Personnel:** BJ

**Driller:** CCC Geotech and Enviro Drilling Ltd.

**Drilling Equipment:** Truck Mount CME 55

**Drilling Method:** HSA

SUBSURFACE PROFILE		SAMPLE DATA					Shear Strength × (kPa) × 50 100 150 200	Water Content ▽ (%) ▽ 25 50 75	Water Level (Standpipe or Open Borehole)	
Depth	Soil Description	Elev./Depth(m)	Lithology	Type	Sample Number	N or RQD	Recovery (%)	SPT N Value ○ (Blows/0.3 m) ○ 20 40 60 80		Liquid Limit □ (%) □ 25 50 75
0	Ground Surface	110.95								
0	Topsoil- sandy, about 450 mm thick.	0.00								
1	FILL- sand, brown, moist, loose.	110.65			SS1	8	33	8	12	
2		0.30								
3	BEDROCK- limestone, weathered at surface, grey.	110.30								
3		0.65								
4	End of Borehole	109.88			SS2	80+	100	80+	13	
4		1.07								
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
16										

**Eastings:** 454767 m

**Northing:** 5015273 m

**Site Datum:** Site Benchmark - 2 nails in utility pole - 116.310 m

**Groundsurface Elevation:** 110.950 m

**Top of Riser Elev.:** N/A

**Hole Diameter:** 200 mm

**NOTES:** Borehole terminated after practical auger refusal.



Project No.: 190271

Client: Holzman Consultants Inc.

Date: October 8, 2019

**Borehole Log: BH3**

Project: Proposed Automotive Dealership and Body Shop

Location: 5254 Bank Street, Ottawa ON

Field Personnel: BJ

Driller: CCC Geotech and Enviro Drilling Ltd.

Drilling Equipment: Truck Mount CME 55

Drilling Method: HSA

SUBSURFACE PROFILE		SAMPLE DATA					Shear Strength × (kPa) × 50 100 150 200	Water Content ▽ (%) ▽ 25 50 75	Water Level (Standpipe or Open Borehole)		
Depth ft m	Soil Description	Elev./Depth(m)	Lithology	Type	Sample Number	N or RQD	Recovery (%)	SPT N Value ○ (Blows/0.3 m) ○ 20 40 60 80		Liquid Limit □ (%) □ 25 50 75	
0	Ground Surface	113.65									
0	Asphalt - about 50 mm thick.	0.00									
1	FILL- sand, some gravel, brown, moist, loose to compact.		[Cross-hatched pattern]	[Hourglass symbol]	SS1	6	17	6	5		
2											
3			[Cross-hatched pattern]	[Hourglass symbol]	SS2	12	8	12	4		
4											
5	SILT- some sand, trace gravel sized stone, brown, moist, dense to very dense.	112.20	[Cross-hatched pattern]	[Hourglass symbol]							
6		1.45			SS3	8	17	8	10		
7											
8			[Cross-hatched pattern]	[Hourglass symbol]	SS4	68	85	68	10		
9											
10			[Cross-hatched pattern]	[Hourglass symbol]							
11					SS5	48	75	48	11		
12	End of Borehole	109.99	[Cross-hatched pattern]	[Hourglass symbol]							
13		3.66									
14											
15											

Easting: 454776 m

Northing: 5015290 m

Site Datum: Site Benchmark - 2 nails in utility pole - 116.310 m

Groundsurface Elevation: 113.650 m

Top of Riser Elev.: N/A

Hole Diameter: 200 mm

**NOTES:** Borehole terminated after practical auger refusal.



**Project No.:** 190271

**Client:** Holzman Consultants Inc.

**Date:** October 8, 2019

**Borehole Log: BH4**

**Project:** Proposed Automotive Dealership and Body Shop

**Location:** 5254 Bank Street, Ottawa ON

**Field Personnel:** BJ

**Driller:** CCC Geotech and Enviro Drilling Ltd.

**Drilling Equipment:** Truck Mount CME 55

**Drilling Method:** HSA

SUBSURFACE PROFILE		SAMPLE DATA					Shear Strength × (kPa) × 50 100 150 200	Water Content ▽ (%) ▽ 25 50 75	Water Level (Standpipe or Open Borehole)
Depth ft m	Soil Description	Elev./Depth(m)	Lithology	Type	Sample Number	N or RQD	Recovery (%)	SPT N Value ○ (Blows/0.3 m) ○ 20 40 60 80	
								0	Ground Surface
0	Topsoil- sandy, about 100 mm thick.	0.00							
1	FILL- sand, some gravel, brown, moist, compact.	0.10			SS1	44	85	44	11
1	BEDROCK- limestone, weathered at surface, grey.	113.73							
2	End of Borehole	113.48							
2		0.66							
3									
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									

**Eastings:** 454795 m

**Northing:** 5015306 m

**Site Datum:** Site Benchmark - 2 nails in utility pole - 116.310 m

**Groundsurface Elevation:** 114.140 m

**Top of Riser Elev.:** N/A

**Hole Diameter:** 200 mm

**NOTES:** Borehole terminated after practical auger refusal.



**Project No.:** 190271

**Client:** Holzman Consultants Inc.

**Date:** October 8, 2019

**Borehole Log: BH5**

**Project:** Proposed Automotive Dealership and Body Shop

**Location:** 5254 Bank Street, Ottawa ON

**Field Personnel:** BJ

**Driller:** CCC Geotech and Enviro Drilling Ltd.

**Drilling Equipment:** Truck Mount CME 55

**Drilling Method:** HSA

SUBSURFACE PROFILE		SAMPLE DATA					Shear Strength × (kPa) × 50 100 150 200	Water Content ▽ (%) ▽ 25 50 75	Water Level (Standpipe or Open Borehole)	
Depth	Soil Description	Elev./Depth(m)	Lithology	Type	Sample Number	N or RQD	Recovery (%)	SPT N Value ○ (Blows/0.3 m) ○ 20 40 60 80		Liquid Limit □ (%) □ 25 50 75
0	Ground Surface	114.04								
0	Topsoil- sandy, about 250 mm thick.	0.00								
1	FILL- sand, some gravel, brown, moist, compact.	113.79	[Cross-hatched pattern]	[Black triangle]	SS1	18	33	18	12	
3		112.62			SS2	16	75	16	12	
5	End of Borehole	1.42								

**Easting:** 454809 m

**Northing:** 5015303 m

**Site Datum:** Site Benchmark - 2 nails in utility pole - 116.310 m

**Groundsurface Elevation:** 114.040 m

**Top of Riser Elev.:** N/A

**Hole Diameter:** 200 mm

**NOTES:** Borehole terminated after practical auger refusal.





Project No.: 220536

Client: Unpoised Architecture Inc.

Date: June 9, 2023

**Borehole Log: BH6**

Project: Proposed Industrial Service/Repair Building

Location: 5254 Bank Street, Ottawa ON

Field Personnel: SV

Driller: CCC Geotech and Enviro Drilling Ltd.

Drilling Equipment: Truck Mount CME 55

Drilling Method: Hollow Stem Auger

SUBSURFACE PROFILE		SAMPLE DATA					Shear Strength (kPa)	Water Content (%)	Monitoring Well Details			
Depth ft / m	Soil Description	Elev./Depth (m)	Type	Sample Number	N or RQD	Recovery (%)	50	150		25	50	75
							SPT N Value (Blows/0.3 m)			Liquid Limit (%)		
0	Ground Surface	113.01										
0	<b>FILL</b> sand and gravel, brown, loose, moist.	0.00	▲▼	SS1	8	50	8		5			
2		112.32										
1	<b>SILT and SAND</b> trace clay, greyish brown, loose to very loose, moist.	0.69	▲▼	SS2	1	25	1		12			
3												
4			▲▼									
5			▲▼	SS3	4	50	4		10			
6			▲▼									
7			▲▼									
8			▲▼	SS4	11	50	11		15			
9		110.17										
3	End of Borehole	2.84										
10												
11												
12												
13												
4												
14												
15												
5												
16												
17												
18												
19												

Easting: 454770 m

Northing: 5015283 m

Site Datum: Site Benchmark - 2 nails in utility pole - 116.310 m

Groundsurface Elevation: 113.011 m

Top of Riser Elev.: NA

Hole Diameter: 200 mm

Monitoring Well Diameter: N/A

**NOTES:**

Borehole terminated after practical auger refusal.



**Project No.:** 220536

**Client:** Unpoised Architecture Inc.

**Date:** June 9, 2023

**Borehole Log: BH7**

**Project:** Proposed Industrial Service/Repair Building

**Location:** 5254 Bank Street, Ottawa ON

**Field Personnel:** SV

**Driller:** CCC Geotech and Enviro Drilling Ltd.

**Drilling Equipment:** Truck Mount CME 55

**Drilling Method:** Hollow Stem Auger

SUBSURFACE PROFILE		SAMPLE DATA					Shear Strength (kPa)	Water Content (%)	Monitoring Well Details			
Depth	Soil Description	Elev./Depth (m)	Type	Sample Number	N or RQD	Recovery (%)	50	150		25	50	75
							SPT N Value (Blows/0.3 m)			Liquid Limit (%)		
0	Ground Surface	110.94										
0	<b>FILL MATERIAL</b> sand and gravel, brown, compact, moist.	0.00	▲	SS1	11	50	11		8			
1												
2												
3	End of Borehole	110.08										
3		0.86										
4												
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												
13												
14												
15												
16												
17												
18												
19												

**Easting:** 454771 m

**Northing:** 5015280 m

**Site Datum:** Site Benchmark - 2 nails in utility pole - 116.310 m

**Groundsurface Elevation:** 110.94 m

**Top of Riser Elev.:** NA

**Hole Diameter:** 200 mm

**Monitoring Well Diameter:** N/A

**NOTES:**

Borehole terminated after practical auger refusal.



Project No.: 220536

Client: Unpoised Architecture Inc.

Date: June 9, 2023

**Borehole Log: BH8**

Project: Proposed Industrial Service/Repair Building

Location: 5254 Bank Street, Ottawa ON

Field Personnel: SV

Driller: CCC Geotech and Enviro Drilling Ltd.

Drilling Equipment: Truck Mount CME 55

Drilling Method: Hollow Stem Auger

SUBSURFACE PROFILE		SAMPLE DATA					Shear Strength (kPa)	Water Content (%)	Monitoring Well Details			
Depth	Soil Description	Elev./Depth (m)	Type	Sample Number	N or RQD	Recovery (%)	50	150		25	50	75
							SPT N Value (Blows/0.3 m)			Liquid Limit (%)		
0	Ground Surface	110.15										
0	<b>FILL MATERIAL</b> silt-sand, trace gravel, brown, loose to compact, moist.	0.00	▲	SS1	6	42	6		8			
1			▲									
2			▲									
3			▲	SS2	15	56	15		15			
4	End of Borehole	108.88										
5		1.27										
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												
13												
14												
15												
16												
17												
18												
19												

Easting: 454773 m

Northing: 5015273 m

Site Datum: Site Benchmark - 2 nails in utility pole - 116.310 m

Groundsurface Elevation: 110.15 m

Top of Riser Elev.: NA

Hole Diameter: 200 mm

Monitoring Well Diameter: N/A

**NOTES:**

Borehole terminated after practical auger refusal.

**APPENDIX C**  
**Symbols and Terms used in Borehole Logs**

# Symbols and Terms Used on Borehole and Test Pit Logs

## 1. Soil Description

The soil descriptions presented in this report are based on commonly accepted methods of classification and identification employed in geotechnical practice. Classification and identification of soil involves some judgement and LRL Associates Ltd. does not guarantee descriptions as exact, but infers accuracy to the extent that is common in current geotechnical practice. Boundaries between zones on the logs are often not distinct but transitional and were interpreted.

### a. Proportion

The proportion of each constituent part, as defined by the grain size distribution, is denoted by the following terms:

Term	Proportions
“trace”	1% to 10%
“some”	10% to 20%
prefix (i.e. “sandy” silt)	20% to 35%
“and” (i.e. sand “and” gravel)	35% to 50%

### b. Compactness and Consistency

The state of compactness of granular soils is defined on the basis of the Standard Penetration Number (N) as per ASTM D-1586. It corresponds to the number of blows required to drive 300 mm of the split spoon sampler using a metal drop hammer that has a weight of 62.5 kg and free fall distance of 760 mm. For a 600 mm long split spoon, the blow counts are recorded for every 150 mm. The “N” value is obtained by adding the number of blows from the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> count. Technical refusal indicates a number of blows greater than 50.

The consistency of clayey or cohesive soils is based on the shear strength of the soil, as determined by field vane tests and by a visual and tactile assessment of the soil strength.

The state of compactness of granular soils is defined by the following terms:

State of Compactness Granular Soils	Standard Penetration Number “N”	Relative Density (%)
Very loose	0 – 4	<15
Loose	4 – 10	15 – 35
Compact	10 - 30	35 – 65
Dense	30 - 50	65 - 85
Very dense	> 50	> 85

The consistency of cohesive soils is defined by the following terms:

Consistency Cohesive Soils	Undrained Shear Strength ( $C_u$ ) (kPa)	Standard Penetration Number “N”
Very soft	<12.5	<2
Soft	12.5 - 25	2 - 4
Firm	25 - 50	4 - 8
Stiff	50 - 100	8 - 15
Very stiff	100 - 200	15 - 30
Hard	>200	>30

### c. Field Moisture Condition

Description (ASTM D2488)	Criteria
Dry	Absence of moisture, dusty, dry to touch.
Moist	Damp, but not visible water.
Wet	Visible, free water, usually soil is below water table.

## 2. Sample Data

### a. Elevation depth

This is a reference to the geodesic elevation of the soil or to a benchmark of an arbitrary elevation at the location of the borehole or test pit. The depth of geological boundaries is measured from ground surface.

**b. Type**

Symbol	Type	Letter Code
⋮	Auger	AU
⚡	Split Spoon	SS
	Shelby Tube	ST
	Rock Core	RC

**c. Sample Number**

Each sample taken from the borehole is numbered in the field as shown in this column.

LETTER CODE (as above) – Sample Number.

**d. Recovery (%)**

For soil samples this is the percentage of the recovered sample obtained versus the length sampled. In the case of rock, the percentage is the length of rock core recovered compared to the length of the drill run.

**3. Rock Description**


Rock Quality Designation (RQD) is a rough measure of the degree of jointing or fracture in a rock mass. The RQD is calculated as the cumulative length of rock pieces recovered having lengths of 100 mm or more divided by the length of coring. The qualitative description of the bedrock based on RQD is given below.

Rock Quality Designation (RQD) (%)	Description of Rock Quality
0 – 25	Very poor
25 – 50	Poor
50 – 75	Fair
75 – 90	Good
90 – 100	Excellent

Strength classification of rock is presented below.


Strength Classification	Range of Unconfined Compressive Strength (MPa)
Extremely weak	< 1
Very weak	1 – 5
Weak	5 – 25
Medium strong	25 – 50
Strong	50 – 100
Very strong	100 – 250
Extremely strong	> 250

**4. General Monitoring Well Data**



**5. Classification of Soils for Engineering Purposes (ASTM D2487)  
(United Soil Classification System)**

Major divisions		Group Symbol	Typical Names	Classification Criteria	
Coarse-grained soils More than 50% retained on No. 200 sieve* (>0.075 mm)	Gravels More than 50% of coarse fraction retained on No. 4 sieve(4.75 mm)	Clean gravels <5% fines	GW Well-graded gravel	<p>Classification on basis of percentage of fines:                      Less than 5% pass No. 200 sieve - GW, GP, SW, SP                      More than 12% pass No. 200 sieve - GM, GC, SM, SC                      5 to 12% pass No. 200 sieve - Borderline classifications, use of dual symbols</p> <p><math>C_u = \frac{D_{60}}{D_{10}} \geq 4</math>; <math>C_c = \frac{(D_{30})^2}{D_{10} \times D_{60}}</math> between 1 and 3</p> <p>Not meeting either <math>C_u</math> or <math>C_c</math> criteria for GW</p> <p>Atterberg limits below "A" line or PI less than 4                      Atterberg limits on or above "A" line and PI &gt; 7                      Atterberg limits plotting in hatched area are borderline classifications requiring use of dual symbols                      If fines are organic add "with organic fines" to group name</p> <p><math>C_u = \frac{D_{60}}{D_{10}} \geq 6</math>; <math>C_c = \frac{(D_{30})^2}{D_{10} \times D_{60}}</math> between 1 and 3</p> <p>Not meeting either <math>C_u</math> or <math>C_c</math> criteria for SW</p> <p>Atterberg limits below "A" line or PI less than 4                      Atterberg limits on or above "A" line and PI &gt; 7                      Atterberg limits plotting in hatched area are borderline classifications requiring use of dual symbols                      If fines are organic add "with organic fines" to group name</p>	
		GP Poorly graded gravel			
		Gravels with >12% fines	GM Silty gravel		
		GC Clayey gravel			
	Sands 50% or more of coarse fraction passes No. 4 sieve(<4.75 mm)	Clean sands <5% fines	SW Well-graded sand		
		SP Poorly graded sand			
		Sands with >12% fines	SM Silty sand		
		SC Clayey sand			
	Fine-grained soils 50% or more passes No. 200 sieve* (<0.075 mm)	Silts and Clays Liquid Limit <50%	Inorganic		ML Silt
			CL Lean Clay -low plasticity		
Organic			OL Organic clay or silt (Clay plots above 'A' Line)		
Silts and Clays Liquid Limit >50%		Inorganic	MH Elastic silt		
		CH Fat Clay -high plasticity			
		Organic	OH Organic clay or silt (Clay plots above 'A' Line)		
Highly Organic Soils		PT	Peat, muck and other highly organic soils	<p>If 15 to 29% coarse-grained, add "with sand" or "with gravel" as appropriate.                      If &gt; 30% coarse-grained, add "sandy" or "gravelly" as appropriate.                      Class as organic when oven dried liquid limit is &lt; 75% of undried liquid limit.</p>	



**APPENDIX D**  
**Laboratory Results**






LRL Associates Ltd.

# PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS

ASTM D 422 / LS-702

**Client:** Holzman Consultants Inc.  
**Project:** Geotechnical Investigation  
**Location:** 5254 Bank Street, Ottawa, ON.

**File No.:** 190271  
**Report No.:** 1  
**Date:** October 8, 2019



Unified Soil Classification System

> 75 mm	% GRAVEL		% SAND			% FINES
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	Silt & Clay
△	0.0	3.4	0.4	1.6	17.9	76.7

Location	Sample	Depth, m	D <sub>60</sub>	D <sub>50</sub>	D <sub>30</sub>	D <sub>15</sub>	D <sub>10</sub>	C <sub>c</sub>	C <sub>u</sub>
△	BH 3	SS-4	2.29 - 2.90						






# PARTICLE SIZE ANALYSIS

ASTM D 422 / LS-702

Client: unPoised Architects INC  
 Project: Geotechnical Investigation  
 Location: 5254 Bank Street, Ottawa, ON.

File No.: 220536  
 Report No.: 1  
 Date: June 9, 2023



	% GRAVEL		% SAND			% FINES	
	Coarse	Fine	Coarse	Medium	Fine	Silt	Clay
△	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.6	35.3	62.4	1.5
■	0.0	3.2	3.3	7.9	29.9	52.0	3.7

	Location	Sample	Depth, m	D <sub>60</sub>	D <sub>50</sub>	D <sub>30</sub>	D <sub>15</sub>	D <sub>10</sub>	C <sub>c</sub>	C <sub>u</sub>
△	BH 6	SS-4	2.29 - 2.90	0.0719	0.0641	0.0484	0.0294	0.0225	1.4	3.2
■	BH 8	SS-2	0.76 - 1.22	0.0871	0.0673	0.0398	0.0164	0.0078	2.3	11.2



## Certificate of Analysis

**LRL Associates Ltd.**

5430 Canotek Road  
Ottawa, ON K1J 9G2  
Attn: Brad Johnson

Client PO:  
Project: 220536  
Custody: 71727

Report Date: 20-Jun-2023  
Order Date: 14-Jun-2023

**Order #: 2324226**

This Certificate of Analysis contains analytical data applicable to the following samples as submitted :

Paracel ID	Client ID
2324226-01	BH6 7.5-9.5

Approved By:



Mark Foto, M.Sc.  
Lab Supervisor

Certificate of Analysis

Report Date: 20-Jun-2023

Client: LRL Associates Ltd.

Order Date: 14-Jun-2023

Client PO:

Project Description: 220536

### Analysis Summary Table

Analysis	Method Reference/Description	Extraction Date	Analysis Date
Anions	EPA 300.1 - IC, water extraction	19-Jun-23	19-Jun-23
pH, soil	EPA 150.1 - pH probe @ 25 °C, CaCl buffered ext.	14-Jun-23	15-Jun-23
Resistivity	EPA 120.1 - probe, water extraction	15-Jun-23	15-Jun-23
Solids, %	CWS Tier 1 - Gravimetric	15-Jun-23	16-Jun-23

Certificate of Analysis  
 Client: LRL Associates Ltd.  
 Client PO:

Report Date: 20-Jun-2023  
 Order Date: 14-Jun-2023  
 Project Description: 220536

<b>Client ID:</b>	BH6 7.5-9.5	-	-	-
<b>Sample Date:</b>	09-Jun-23 09:00	-	-	-
<b>Sample ID:</b>	2324226-01	-	-	-
<b>MDL/Units</b>	Soil	-	-	-

**Physical Characteristics**

% Solids	0.1 % by Wt.	85.8	-	-	-
----------	--------------	------	---	---	---

**General Inorganics**

pH	0.05 pH Units	7.36	-	-	-
Resistivity	0.1 Ohm.m	73.4	-	-	-

**Anions**

Chloride	10 ug/g dry	<10	-	-	-
Sulphate	10 ug/g dry	19	-	-	-

Certificate of Analysis  
 Client: LRL Associates Ltd.  
 Client PO:

Report Date: 20-Jun-2023  
 Order Date: 14-Jun-2023  
 Project Description: 220536

**Method Quality Control: Blank**

Analyte	Result	Reporting Limit	Units	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limit	RPD	RPD Limit	Notes
<b>Anions</b>									
Chloride	ND	10	ug/g						
Sulphate	ND	10	ug/g						
<b>General Inorganics</b>									
Resistivity	ND	0.1	Ohm.m						

Certificate of Analysis  
 Client: LRL Associates Ltd.  
 Client PO:

Report Date: 20-Jun-2023  
 Order Date: 14-Jun-2023  
 Project Description: 220536

**Method Quality Control: Duplicate**

Analyte	Result	Reporting Limit	Units	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limit	RPD	RPD Limit	Notes
<b>Anions</b>									
Chloride	ND	10	ug/g	ND			NC	35	
Sulphate	19.5	10	ug/g	18.7			4.1	35	
<b>General Inorganics</b>									
pH	7.15	0.05	pH Units	7.18			0.4	2.3	
Resistivity	78.7	0.1	Ohm.m	77.5			1.6	20	
<b>Physical Characteristics</b>									
% Solids	94.8	0.1	% by Wt.	94.5			0.3	25	

Certificate of Analysis  
 Client: LRL Associates Ltd.  
 Client PO:

Report Date: 20-Jun-2023  
 Order Date: 14-Jun-2023  
 Project Description: 220536

**Method Quality Control: Spike**

Analyte	Result	Reporting Limit	Units	Source Result	%REC	%REC Limit	RPD	RPD Limit	Notes
<b>Anions</b>									
Chloride	106	10	ug/g	ND	106	82-118			
Sulphate	120	10	ug/g	18.7	102	80-120			



Certificate of Analysis

Report Date: 20-Jun-2023

Client: LRL Associates Ltd.

Order Date: 14-Jun-2023

Client PO:

Project Description: 220536

**Qualifier Notes:**

**Sample Data Revisions**

None

**Work Order Revisions / Comments:**

None

**Other Report Notes:**

n/a: not applicable

ND: Not Detected

MDL: Method Detection Limit

Source Result: Data used as source for matrix and duplicate samples

%REC: Percent recovery.

RPD: Relative percent difference.

NC: Not Calculated

Soil results are reported on a dry weight basis when the units are denoted with 'dry'.  
Where %Solids is reported, moisture loss includes the loss of volatile hydrocarbons.